

Application No.: 10/025,805
Amendment Dated: October 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action of: July 25, 2005

MTS-3299US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-31 are presently pending and all claims stand rejected. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration in view of the remarks below.

Specification

Section 2 of the Office Action recites that "[t]he title of the invention is not descriptive." The Office Action suggests the following title: "E-Mail Address Change Notification System." Applicant herein amends the title of the specification from "A Proxy System For Informing E-Mail Address Change, Proxy Method For Informing E-Mail Address Change" to "E-mail Address Change Notification System" in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

In Section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,427,164 to Reilly (herein "Reilly") and U.S. Patent No. 6,405,234 to Nielsen (herein "Nielsen"). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Reilly is directed to systems and electronic mail (e-mail) methods for automatically forwarding e-mail messages when the intended recipient's new e-mail address is otherwise unknown. In Reilly, some or all participants in the e-mail process (e.g., the sending user, the sending server, the receiving server, the receiving user, and other participants) are aware of a "forwarding list server." See column 3, lines 12-14. The "forwarding list server" includes information necessary for forwarding e-mail message (e.g., the recipient's old e-mail address and the recipient's new e-mail address). See column 3, lines 27-29 of Reilly. When a receiving server receives an e-mail message addressed to the recipient's old e-mail

address, the receiving server may communicate with the "forwarding list server" to obtain the recipient's new e-mail address and then the receiving server may forward the e-mail message to the recipient's new e-mail address. In addition, the "forwarding list server" may notify the sending user of the recipient's new e-mail address.

Nielsen is directed to methods and systems for updating e-mail addresses. In Nielsen, after a recipient changes his or her e-mail address, the recipient sends information regarding the updated e-mail address to an address-change server. The address-change server stores the updated e-mail information in its database. When a sender wants to reach a recipient whose e-mail address has changed, the sender sends an e-mail message to the address-change server. The address-change server sends a reply e-mail message to the sender that includes the recipient's updated e-mail address using the information stored in the database. The sender then identifies the recipient's updated e-mail address, creates a new e-mail message, inserts the recipient's updated e-mail address into the "to" line of the new message, and sends the new message to the recipient. See abstract and column 2, line 58 through column 3, line 4 of Nielsen.

Applicant's invention, as recited by claim 1, includes the following features (at least one of which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the applied art):

a first provider server in which a first e-mail address of a client is set;

a second provider server in which a second e-mail address of said client is set; and

an address change notification deputization service server,

wherein said first provider server transfers an e-mail that is sent to said first mail address to said second provider server upon receiving this e-mail,

wherein **said second provider server transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from said first provider server to said address change notification deputation service server upon receiving this e-mail**, and

wherein **said address change notification deputation service server checks the path of the e-mail that has been transferred from said second provider server and makes a notification to the sender of the e-mail to the effect that the e-mail address of said client is said second mail address in the case that this e-mail is received by said second provider server after transferred by said first provider server.**

This means that a first e-mail address (old e-mail address) for a client (intended recipient) is set in a first provider server and a second e-mail address (new e-mail address) for the client is set in a second provider server. E-mail messages sent to the old e-mail address are transferred from the first provider server to the second provider server. In addition, e-mail messages transferred from the first provider server to the second provider server are transferred to an address change notification deputation service server by the second provider server. The address change notification deputation service server checks the path of the e-mail message transferred by the second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail message of the new e-mail address set in the second provider server if the e-mail message is received by the second provider server after being transferred by the first provider server.

Applicant maintains that neither Reilly nor Nielsen disclose, teach, or suggest a second provider server that transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to an address change notification deputization service server. To teach this feature, the applied references would first have to describe transferring an e-mail message from a first provider server to a second provider server and then describe transferring that same e-mail from the second provider server to an address change notification deputization service server. Neither Reilly nor Nielsen disclose such a feature.

In Reilly, a receiving (first provider) server that receives an e-mail message addressed to an unknown or invalid e-mail address (i.e. an old e-mail address) for an intended recipient sends a query to a forwarding address server to retrieve a new e-mail address for the intended recipient. The first provider server may then transfer the e-mail message to the intended recipient using the new e-mail address. Reilly, however, is devoid of transferring an e-mail message from a first provider server to a second provider server and then transferring that e-mail message from the second provider server to an address change notification deputization service server.

In responding to the Applicant's arguments filed on May 5, 2005 regarding the failure of Reilly to disclose, teach or suggest a second provider server that transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to an address change notification deputization service server, the Office Action recites that "Reilly discloses that the new e-mail address can be supplied to the 'forwarding listserver' (notification deputization service server) by any other entity, such as the user's new ISP (second server) after it receives from the user from their previous e-mail address (first server) (column 2, lines 63-67 & column 3, lines 1-26)." Applicant respectfully disagrees that these sections of Reilly (in fact, any of Reilly) discloses, teaches or suggests a second provider server that transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to an address change notification deputization service server. This section of Reilly simply discloses that an e-mail address is supplied to a forwarding listserver. This is unlike the claimed invention in which the entire e-mail message, not just the e-mail address, is

transferred to the address change notification deputation service server. Additionally, the recited section is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of an e-mail message being transferred from a first provider server to a second provider server and then being transferred from the second provider server to an address change notification deputation service server as set forth by the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that Reilly fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a second service provider server that transfers an e-mail address that has been transferred from a first provider server to an address change notification deputation service server.

In Nielsen, when a sender wants to reach a recipient whose e-mail address has changed from an old e-mail address to a new e-mail address, the sender sends an email message with the old e-mail address to an address-change server, which arguably may function as a first provider server. The address-change server includes a list of the old and new e-mail addresses and may return the new address to the sender to resend the e-mail and/or forward the e-mail to a second provider server associated with the new e-mail address. Nielsen, however, is devoid of transferring an e-mail message from the first provider server to the second provider server and then transferring the e-mail message from the second provider server to an address change notification deputation service server.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, neither Reilly nor Nielsen disclose, teach or suggest a second provider server that transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to an address change notification deputation service server as recited in claim 1.

In addition, Applicant maintains that neither Reilly nor Nielsen disclose, teach, or suggest an address change notification deputation service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server.

In the Office Action, Nielsen is relied upon to teach checking the path of an e-mail message that has been transferred from a first provider server to a second provider server and in the case that this e-mail is received by the second provider after transferred from the first provider server, the address change notification deputation service server makes a notification. In Nielsen, when a sender wants to reach a recipient whose e-mail address has changed, the sender sends an e-mail message including the recipient's old e-mail address directly to an address change server. The address change server then sends the recipient's new e-mail address back to the sender. Nielsen, however, is devoid of checking the path of an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to a second provider server and makes a notification to a sender in the case that the e-mail is received by the second provider server after transferred by the first provider server. The address change server in Nielsen simply stores updated e-mail address information in a database and sends reply e-mails to the sender with the recipient's updated e-mail address. Therefore, the address change server in Nielsen never checks the path of the e-mail that has been transferred from a second provider server and never checks whether this e-mail is received by the second provider server after transfer by a first provider server. In addition, the address change notification deputation service server of the present invention does not have a database such as the one in the address change server of Nielsen because the address change notification deputation service server of the present invention does not need to check a database for the new address itself because this information is obtained from the path of the transferred e-mail.

Applicant is confused by the Examiner's response to Applicant's argument that neither Reilly nor Neilson disclose, teach or suggest an address change notification deputation server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail that the e-mail received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server. As acknowledged in section 5 of the Office Action Reilly does not disclose these features. The Office Action then recites in section 17 that "Reilly disclosed that the 'forwarding listserver' includes the forwarding information, which can include old address, new address and other form of information and then

transferred" and that "it would have been obvious to include the path information that the e-mail took in the forwarding information." Applicant fails to see the relevance of this information to disclosing, teaching or suggesting an address change notification deputation service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mails received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server. In Reilly some or all participants in the e-mail process (the sending user, the sending server, the receiving server, the receiving user, and any other participant) are aware that there is an entity, the "forwarding listserver" which may have on file and available for an electronic mail participant the new address for a particular user name which is unknown to the receiving server. Applicant does not understand what would make it obvious to include path information that an e-mail took in the forwarding information within the forwarding listserver as the forwarding listserver simply includes the old address and the new address.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, neither Reilly nor Nielsen disclose, teach or suggest an address change notification deputation service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server.

Therefore, as set forth above, Reilly and Nielsen fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. Namely, Reilly and Nielsen fail to disclose teach or suggest a second provider server that transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to an address change notification deputation service server and an address change notification deputation service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server. Accordingly, Applicant contends that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/025,805
Amendment Dated: October 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action of: July 25, 2005

MTS-3299US

Independent claims 10 and 19-31, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant contends that these claims are also allowable over the applied art for the reasons set forth above that claim 1 is allowable and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 include all the features of the independent claim from which they depend. Thus, Applicant contends that claims 2-9 and 11-18 are also allowable over the applied art for the reasons set forth above and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance and early notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel N. Calder

Daniel N. Calder, Reg. No. 27,424
Stephen J. Weed, Reg. No. 45,202
Attorneys for Applicant

DNC/SJW/dmw

Dated: October 25, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 25, 2005.

Donna M. Wellings

Donna M. Wellings

DMW_I:\MTS\3299US\AMEND_02.DOC